UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,895	10/19/2001	Christian Gheorghe	289476.124 US1	8307

28089 7590 04/05/2006

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP
399 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER	
HAMZA, FARUK	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/032,895	GHEORGHE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Faruk Hamza	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-57* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4,5,26,34,53 and 54* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to RCE

1. This action is responsive to the RCE filed on January 24, 2006. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-54 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1,3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "a list of survived recommendations that are transmitted" in line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the likelihood" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application

by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claim 1,3, 6-9,15,18-22,25, 27-31,33, 35-38,46 and 49-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pyo et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,636,836) hereinafter referred as Pyo.

Pyo teaches the invention as claimed including a system, which includes multiple recommendation agents. A recommendation manager selects one or more agents using the basic information and influential power information generates a final list of recommendation (See abstract).

As to claim 1, Pyo teaches a recommendation system for delivering a list of recommendations to a requester system over a computer network, the recommendation system comprising:

a plurality of producer modules in communication with the requester system, each of the plurality of producer modules receiving a request for recommendations from the requester system and producing a list of initial recommendations in response thereto, each of the recommendations in a list of initial recommendations including a confidence level and a producer identifier (Fig. 6, Column 5, lines 11-55, Pyo discloses plurality of recommendation agent) ; and

a recommendation engine comprising:

a weighting module modifying each of the confidence levels in a given list of initial recommendations based on a weighting value associated with the producer module that produced the given list of initial recommendations (Column 5, lines 43- Column 6, lines 27, Pyo discloses modifying confidence levels);

a recommendation module selecting one or more of the recommendations from the lists of initial recommendations based on the confidence levels of the recommendations to produce a list of survived recommendations that are transmitted to the recommender system (Column 5, lines 30-Column 6, lines 34 Pyo discloses selecting one or more recommendations from the list); and

an adjustment module adjusting the weighting values associated with each of the producer modules based on information from the requester system related to the list of survived recommendations transmitted to the requester system (Column 5, lines 11-Column 6, lines 54, Pyo discloses adjusting weighting values (influential power)).

Claims 22,27 and 31 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 1 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 3, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 2, wherein the selection module:

selects a first predetermined number N of recommendations from the sorted list of recommendations (Column 4, lines 26-45);

selects a second predetermined number M of recommendations from the first predetermined number N of recommendations, wherein the likelihood of a given one of the M recommendations being selected from the first predetermined number N of recommendations is related to the confidence level of the given one of the M recommendation (Column 4, 26-45); and

selects the one or more survived recommendations from the second predetermined number of initial recommendations (Column 26-45).

Claims 25 and 33 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 3 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 6, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, wherein the weighting module modifies each of the confidence levels in a given list of initial recommendations by multiplying each of the confidence levels in a given list of initial recommendations by the weighting value associated with the

producer module that produced the given list of initial recommendations (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 54).

Claim 35 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 6 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 7, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, wherein each of the recommendations in a list of initial recommendations also includes an object identifier (Column 6, lines 4-50).

Claim 36 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 7 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 8, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, wherein at least one of the recommendations in a list of initial recommendations also includes a request identifier that identifies the request for recommendations from the requester system (Column 4, lines 26-Column 5, lines 30).

Claim 37 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 8 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 9, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, wherein at least one of the recommendations in one of the lists of initial recommendations also includes a session identifier that identifies a session on the requestor system (Column 4, lines 26-Column 5, lines 30).

Claim 38 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 9 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 15, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, wherein the request includes a requester agent (Column 4, lines 26-45).

Claim 46 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 15 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 18, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, wherein the request includes a tracking identification attribute (Track ID) (inheritance feature).

Claim 49 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 18 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 19, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 18, wherein the Track ID is a session identifier (inheritance feature).

Claim 50 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 19 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 20, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 18, wherein the Track ID is a user identifier (inheritance feature).

Claim 51 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 20 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 21, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, wherein the request includes a request number (RecCount) indicating a number of request to be transmitted to the requester system (inheritance feature).

Claim 52 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 21 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 28, Pyo teaches the method of claim 27, wherein the information received from the requester system includes a plurality of user reaction values, wherein each of the plurality of user reaction values is associated with a different one of the plurality of survived recommendations transmitted to the requester system (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

As to claim 29, Pyo teaches the method of claim 28, wherein each user reaction value is indicative of a positive user reaction to the recommendation to which the user reaction value is associated (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

As to claim 30, Pyo teaches the method of claim 28, wherein each user reaction value is indicative of positive and negative user reactions to the

recommendation to which the user reaction value is associated (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 10-14, 16-17, 39-45 and 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyo et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,636,836) as applied above, and further in view of Reese (U.S. Patent Number 6,236,980).

Pyo teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system, which includes multiple recommendation agents. A recommendation manager selects one or more agents using the basic information and influential power information generates a final list of recommendation (See abstract).

As to claim 10, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, lists of initial recommendations (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Pyo does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of recommendation identifier.

However, Reese teaches the claimed limitation of recommendation identifier (Fig. 47)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding identifiers to recommendations, which will make it easy to identify the recommendations. One would be motivated to do so to enhance the system's usability.

Claim 39 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 10 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 11, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, and initial recommendations list (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Pyo does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of list includes URL.

However, Reese teachs the claimed limitation of list includes URL (Column 8, lines 7-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding URL to recommendations list, which identifies specific resources on the Internet, such as web pages. One would be motivated to do so to enhance the system's usability.

Claim 40 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 11 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 12, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, and initial recommendations list (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Pyo does not explicitly teach claimed limitation title of a web page.

However, Reese teaches the claimed limitation title of we page (Column 17, lines 51-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding the functionality to include title of a web page. One would be motivated to do so for greater ease and convenience.

Claim 43 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 12 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 13, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, and initial recommendations list (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Pyo does not explicitly teach claimed limitation summery of the web page.

However, Reese teaches claimed limitation summery of the web page (Column 17, lines 51-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding the functionality to include summery of a web page. One would be motivated to do so for greater ease and convenience.

Claim 44 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 13 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 14, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, and initial recommendations list (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Pyo does not explicitly teach claimed limitation image.

However, Reese teaches claimed limitation image (Fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding image in recommendation list. One would be motivated to do so for greater ease and convenience.

Claim 45 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 14 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 16, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1, and request (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Pyo does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of request including URL Key.

However, Reese teaches the claimed limitation of request including URL Key (Column 8, lines 7-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding URL Key. One would be motivated to do so to enhance the system's usability.

Claim 47 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 16 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 17, Pyo teaches the recommendation system of claim 1 (Column 5, lines 42-Column 6, lines 50).

Pyo does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of request including site ID.

However, Reese teaches the claimed limitation of site ID (Column 17, lines 51-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding site ID. One would be motivated to do so to enhance the system's usability.

Claim 48 does not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 17 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

5. Claims 2,23-24 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pyo and Reese as applied above, and further in view of Bieganski et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,334,127) hereinafter referred as Bienganski.

As to claim 2, Pyo teaches the method of claim 1 further comprises assembling initial recommendation list and confidence level (Column 2, lines 23-67).

Pyo does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of sorting the recommendation list.

However, Bienganski teaches the claimed limitation of sorting the recommendation list (Column 15, lines 8-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pyo by adding URL to recommendations list, which will rearrange record in database file. One would be motivated to do so to enhance the system's usability.

Claims 23-24 and 32 do not teach or define any new limitation other than above claim 2 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 4,5,26,34,53 and 54 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Hosken (U.S. Patent Number 6,438,579) discloses automated content recommendations system.
- Koing et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,981,040) discloses automatic personalized online information.
- Hofmann et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,687,696) discloses system for personalized search.
- Chislenko et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,092,049) discloses method for efficiently recommending item.
- Schuetze et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,567,797) discloses system for providing recommendations.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is 571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll –free).

Faruk Hamza

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unite 2155

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER